

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
RE: MINOR MODIFICATION OF THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE
CHURCH PROPOSAL AGREEMENT
FENWAY URBAN RENEWAL AREA**

WHEREAS, Section 201 of the Proposed Agreement by and between the Boston Redevelopment Authority and the Christian Science Church provides for the submission of complete proposals by the Church for redevelopment of Parcels 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 11 not later than December 22, 1969; and

WHEREAS, despite diligent effort on its part the Church will be unable to complete said proposals within said time period; and

WHEREAS, the Church proposes to complete and submit all proposals not later than June 22, 1970 for Parcels 2 and 11, and December 22, 1970 for Parcels 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9, and if possible, in advance of these dates;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY:

THAT the Director be and hereby is authorized to execute an amendment to Section 201 of the proposed Agreement by and between the Boston Redevelopment Authority and the Christian Science Church extending the time for the submission of proposals for Parcels 2 and 11 to June 22, 1970 and extending the time for the submission of proposals for Parcels 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9 until December 22, 1970.

MEMORANDUM

DECEMBER 11, 1969

TO: Boston Redevelopment Authority

FROM: John D. Warner, Director

SUBJECT: MINOR MODIFICATION OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE CHURCH
PROPOSAL AGREEMENT
FENWAY URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT
NO. MASS. R-115

1515
12/11

SUMMARY: This memorandum requests that the Director be authorized to execute an amendment to the Proposal Agreement with the Christian Science Church to allow the Church a six-month extension of time for the submission of proposals for the redevelopment of Parcels 2 and 11, and a one-year extension of time for the submission of proposals for the redevelopment of Parcels 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9 in the Fenway Urban Renewal Area.

Under the terms of the Fenway Urban Renewal Plan, Section 403, a Proposal Agreement was to be executed by and between the Authority and the Christian Science Church establishing the terms for the comprehensive development of all Church-owned properties within the Fenway Urban Renewal Area. Such an Agreement, in form satisfactory to the Authority, was executed on February 26, 1969. Pursuant to Section 201 of this Agreement, the Church must submit satisfactory proposals for each of its properties by December 22, 1969, after which time the properties become subject to acquisition by the Authority. These properties involve Disposition Parcels 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 11.

The proposals for Parcels 2 and 11 are in the final stages. The Church has arranged to convey Parcel 2 to a developer, plans have been prepared, a contractor has been chosen, and financing has been obtained. A draft Regulatory Agreement has been submitted to the Authority and is presently being reviewed. Parcel 11, calling for a large apartment complex with ground floor retail uses, is in the same advanced stage, except for the Draft Regulatory Agreement, which will be submitted to the Authority within two weeks.

The proposal for Parcel 3 would have been virtually complete but for the fact that the Church's chosen developer, Boise Cascade Company found the plans infeasible for it and terminated its interest on September 25, 1969. The Church has chosen a new developer, Wasserman Development Corporation, and I. M. Pei and Partners have been retained as architects. A proposal, calling for about 280 moderate-income apartments with ground floor retail and appropriate inside parking, is being prepared by these companies.

Parcels 5 and 6, jointly, and 7 and 9, jointly, are to consist of two identical low-income housing developments. I. M. Pei and Partners are the architects, a sponsoring group has been selected, and Volpe Construction Company is the prospective contractor. An application has been filed with FHA requesting an allocation of Section 236 funds, and an early approval is anticipated.

In summary, the Church has proceeded diligently in preparing final plans for each of its properties. Delays occasioned by difficulties in assembling suitable development teams and lengthy negotiations with FHA as to financial feasibility, however, have made it apparent that these proposals cannot be completed and executed by the December 22 deadline.

Because of the advanced stage of the proposals for Parcels 2 and 11, a six-month extension of time is adequate for these two parcels. An extension of one year is appropriate for Parcels 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9. It is anticipated that final proposals for several of these parcels will be executed in advance of the new deadline.

An appropriate Resolution is attached.

Attachment

